

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>European Journal of Nutrition &amp; Food Safety</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_EJNFS_121133</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>“OPTIMIZATION OF POPPING PARAMETERS AND NUTRITIONAL PROFILING OF KODO MILLET POPS”</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

## Review Form 3

### PART 1: Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The paper is interesting. The methodology is nicely and soundly explained, with concrete conclusions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is suitable and no corrections are needed	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive, but I would suggest shortening it a bit. The part in "Aims" that explains popping should be put in Introduction section, not in abstract itself.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The paper brings input about the different methods of kodo millet processing, and its nutritional profiling. The results are clearly stated. I believe the obtained results and conclusions could prove beneficial in practice.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Some of the references are older than the year 2000, that should be avoided if possible. However, it is understandable that some methodologies are outdated and have no newer references, so if there are no newer papers who used similar methodologies, then the old references can be accepted.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality should be checked, and some minor corrections are needed. Also, some formatting and corrections of font are also needed. I suggest an online tool (Grammarly or such) to correct English.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The manuscript is well organised, just needs a bit more explanation about the popping process in "Introduction" part	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ana Uhlarik</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Institute of Field and Vegetable Crops, Serbia</b>